

CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER AND EASTERN CHRONICLE.

"WHERE ONCE THESE MAXIMS FIX'D, THAT GOD'S OUR FRIEND, VIRTUE OUR GOOD, AND HAPPINESS OUR END, HOW SOON MUST REASON O'ER THE WORLD PREVAIL, AND ERROR, FRAUD AND SUPERSTITION FAIL."

VOL. XI.

GARDINER, MAINE, FRIDAY, JANUARY 21, 1831.

NEW SERIES, VOL. V.—NO. 3.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
BY SHELDON & DICKMAN.

WILLIAM A. DREW.—Editor.

UNIVERSALISTS.

WHITMAN'S LETTERS.

In our last we promised to present the reader with Mr. Whitman's remarks to Prof. S. on the subject of his attempts to deprive Universalists of their civil rights on account of their religious opinions. They will be found below. It is one of the best evidences which Mr. W. or any one else can offer in proof that the orthodox are enemies to religious liberty—that they have combined to deprive liberal Christians of their most sacred rights.

UNIVERSALISTS.

I perceive, Sir, that you have renewed your attack upon the rights of universalists. In your election sermon, you contended that those who do not believe in punishment after death, should not be permitted to take an oath of office or trust. You have again repeated the same opinion. Now let us see to what this threatened disability amounts. Suppose your only son should be stabbed to the heart by an abandoned assassin. Suppose that ten of the most respectable universalists in the land should happen to be eye-witnesses of the horrid transaction. Suppose the murderer should be seized and brought to trial before an orthodox jury. Suppose no evidence of his guilt could be produced but the testimony of these gentlemen. According to your doctrine, these witnesses are unworthy to be sworn, and therefore the prisoner must go unpunished. Nor is this all. All universalists of this class must be excluded from every office of honor, trust, or emolument, either civil, political, military, commercial, diplomatic, or religious, where an oath of fidelity or allegiance is required. And all this for what cause? Simply because they are unable to find sufficient evidence to believe the wicked will be punished in the next existence; and because they either cannot believe without evidence, or will not act the part of hypocrites. In relation to your denunciation of universalists, permit me to ask you four questions.

In the first place,—In condemning the universalist as unworthy to take an oath, do you not pronounce sentence of condemnation on yourself? You would deprive him of this right, because he does not believe that he shall be punished for his present sins in another world. And is not this your own belief respecting yourself? Do you not believe that God has elected a definite number of the human family to eternal salvation? Do you not believe that none but the elect will be finally saved? Do you not believe that some of this number continue in wickedness until the very day of their death? Do you not believe that no punishment will hereafter be inflicted on the regenerated for any deeds done in the body? Do you not believe yourself to be one of this favored company? Do you not feel morally certain that you shall suffer no misery in the world to come for the sins you may here commit? Do you not feel as positive that you shall be only and continually happy in the next existence, as the Rev. Mr. Ballou does that he shall? How then do your cases differ? I must confess that I am unable to discern the difference. And still you would exclude him from his civil rights, on account of his honest religious belief. But if you entertain precisely the same belief respecting yourself, why should you not be subjected to the same disability? Or if your testimony may be received under oath, why may not his? It may; and unless I am greatly deceived, you will find a great majority of the community as ready to receive his evidence as your own, and as willing to trust his integrity as that of believers in the doctrine of election. So that you condemn yourself, while condemning the universalist.

2. In the second place,—In condemning the universalist doctrine as dangerous, do you not pronounce sentence of condemnation on your own belief? You denounce his opinion, that God makes impenitent sinners holy between death and the resurrection, as of immoral tendency. Is not this your own faith? Do you not believe that all infants are born into this world "personally depraved, destitute of holiness, unlike and opposed to God?" Do you not believe that the Holy Spirit converts all who die in infancy, so that their depravity produces no misery in the world to come? Do you not believe that many who live immoral lives are changed from sin to holiness in the hour of death? How then does your belief upon this point differ from that of the universalist? Is not this the essence of his system, that God changes the polluted soul from depravity to purity before it enters another existence? You certainly agree, that God has power to produce such a change, and that he actually effects it in many instances. I have no doubt, you will aver that there is an infinite difference between your views in another respect. You will affirm, that while the universalist believes God will change every impenitent soul, so that no one shall suffer punishment after death; you, on the contrary, believe that he will change the souls of the elect only, and that the reprobate must be eternally damned. I well know that you make such declarations in your conversation, preaching, and publications. But do not ac-

tions sometimes speak louder than words? When an orthodox minister has buried a profligate son, what has been his opinion concerning the future destiny of the abandoned child? When an orthodox parent has consigned to the grave an unconverted daughter, what has been his belief respecting her eternal condition? Have they believed, that the children of their prayers and affections were sentenced to unutterable, unchangeable, never-ending burnings? I put the question to your own conscience. No; scarcely an instance can you produce, in which an orthodox Christian has really believed that an endangered relative, however wicked, was to be forever damned. So that if you take the feelings, the wishes, the hopes, the true faith of your denomination for the standard of truth on this question, there will be but few souls left among us for endless torments. All this results from your previous belief, that God may, and can, and actually does convert the most depraved wretches in the very hour of death; a belief which I regard as exceedingly erroneous. All therefore are willing the Devil should have sinful strangers and enemies; but they firmly trust that sovereign grace will save all sinful acquaintances and friends. And such a belief the orthodox do not hesitate to avow in conversation. Nay; they even proclaim it to the world in the epitaphs they place on the tombstones of the abandoned. The following shall suffice as one example of the many that might be quoted:

"The mother's sigh, nor friend's tear,
Can't recall thy spirit here;
Yet may a doom more blessed be given,
Hope tells us, we shall meet in heaven."

Is it not then evident, that in condemning the universalist doctrine as of immoral tendency, you pronounce sentence of condemnation on your own belief?

3. In the third place,—In denying the universalist his civil rights, do you not strike a death blow at religious liberty? Will you aver, that he does not make the Bible the standard of his faith and practice? Will you affirm, that he is unfaithful in his examination of the Scriptures? Will you declare, that he is not sincere in his profession? No; I think you will not dare to heap these charges upon his head; for you must know that he has the same right and reason to accuse you of the same offences. And if you can neither bring nor substantiate these accusations against the universalist, your rule of exclusion for honest religious opinions must be productive of endless mischief. For if you may this day deprive him of his civil rights on account of his sincere belief on the subject of punishment, you may to-morrow deprive the unitarian of his rights on account of his sentiments respecting the nature of the Deity. You may aver, that the doctrine of the trinity is plainly revealed on every page of the Bible, and that whoever rejects this fundamental article of Christianity, must be considered an atheist. This has been virtually declared by more than one of your denomination. But you need not stop here. Next week you may affirm that the doctrine of election is clearly taught in the scriptures; and with one of your most distinguished divines, aver, that "it is absolutely necessary to approve of the doctrine of reprobation, in order to be saved." On this plea, you may proceed to deprive the Methodists of their equal and unalienable rights. In your plan of proscription, there is no resting-place, until you have silenced all who will not assent to your Calvinistic creed. Now turn the tables. Suppose the majority of voters next year should prove to be universalists. Suppose they should act on your principle, and deny the orthodox minority their civil rights. Would they not have as much right, and in their own opinion as much reason, for such a proceeding, as you now have for the measure which you propose in relation to them? Is it possible for you to think their system of faith more erroneous, than they believe yours to be? Is it possible for you to regard their doctrine of punishment with more abhorrence, than they feel in respect to your belief of eternal decrees and endless torments? Why then would they not be justified in acting on the same principle of condemnation, when they possess the power of executing their resolves? I can see no difference between the two cases. If you may deprive any man of his civil rights on account of his honest religious opinions, because you are the majority; I know not why any other sect of Christians may not return the compliment, when they secure the majority. Is not this principle of exclusion wholly subversive of religious liberty? Certainly. For wherever any man is punished, no matter what the mode or manner, for his religious sentiments, there can exist no religious freedom. And by advocating this rule of proscription, by establishing this civil disability, do you not aim a death blow at free inquiry and religious liberty?

4. In the fourth place,—In depriving the universalist of his civil rights on account of his religious opinions, do you adopt the most Christian remedy for the existing evil? Just look at some of the consequences of such a course of proceeding. You fear he will perjure himself, if admitted to an oath, because he believes such a crime would receive its full punishment

in this world. To prevent the offence, therefore, you would remove the possibility of the temptation; you would not permit him to enter upon the stand of legal witnesses. You would ascertain his particular belief before you would admit his testimony. Now on the same ground, you may imprison your neighbour, because you fear he may be tempted to steal your property. You might place him beyond the possibility of temptation. But I know of no laws, human or divine, which are founded on such unjust principles. All with which I am acquainted, go on the principle, that it will be time enough to punish the criminal after the offence shall have been committed. I know of none which require the punishment of the innocent, for fear he may be tempted to commit iniquity. And does not our own Constitution make specific provision for the punishment of perjury? Whenever a person is convicted of such a crime, will not the law be executed? Is not this the proper tribunal for all such offences? If the guilty is not detected, will not the divine punishment be as certain, as if he believed in endless burnings? And should not the credibility of a witness be determined, not by his religious creed, but by his previous character? And on this ground, have not the communicants in universalist churches as high standing for strict honesty, rigid impartiality, and firm integrity, as the professors of orthodox communions? Would it not then be the more Christian course to regard such persons as Christians, so far as they profess their belief in revelation, and exhibit a Christian character? Would it not be better to convince them of their errors by fair and scriptural reasoning, and by exhibiting undoubted evidence of the certainty of a future righteous retribution? Now, Sir, I am not saying all this, because I feel any partiality for the doctrine of no punishment after death. No; I regard this opinion equally erroneous with the one cherished by the orthodox on this subject. But I say this because I believe that every man who makes the Bible his standard of faith and practice, and exhibits the fruits of the gospel in his daily walk and conversation, is entitled to the Christian name, rights, and privileges; and because I believe all Christian believers should be on an equal standing in the sight of our civil government. And when I meet and individual of this character, let him be called by what name he may, let me think him in what error I may, I will endeavour to do unto him as I would have him do unto me. And I think a candid consideration of this subject will induce you to regard this as the most Christian remedy for the supposed evil. For an opposite course appears to me subversive of free inquiry, religious liberty, and the principles of congregationalism.

We cannot conclude our extracts from these Letters—Letters which should be in the hands of every inquiring mind, without adding the following on the orthodox system of Tract distribution.

TRACTS.

I perceive, Sir, that you have alluded to the subject of religious tracts. You assert that unitarians accuse the orthodox of being raving mad, and destitute of modesty and humility, because they engage in their publication. You have probably come as near the truth in this statement, as in many others in your late pamphlet. I think you would find it very difficult to mention the unitarian who ever made such an accusation. But for my own part, I am free to confess, that some of the measures adopted by your leaders for the distribution of tracts appear to me very singular. In order to foist them into unitarian families, they have come in the darkness of night, and put them in our well-curbs and our work-shops, scattered them in our door-yards and our gardens, thrown them into our entries and our out-houses, and tied them to our pump-handles and our door-latches. They have stuffed them into the hats and pockets of our dependents, thrust them into the hands and bosoms of our children, and concealed them among the leaves of our borrowed books. They have scattered them in our public and private walks, thrown them to us from waggons and stage-coaches, and strewed them in bar-rooms, and canal-boats, and steam-boats, from Maine to New Orleans. And in these various ways, they have become as plenty in some of our houses, as were the frogs in the dwellings of the Egyptians, not to say as noisome.

But this is not all. A new method of sowing this precious seed has lately been invented, and has already been put into extensive operation. Let me illustrate this assertion by an example of recent occurrence. The circumstances are briefly these. There are about one thousand inhabitants in the place. They all attend a unitarian meeting. One of your organizers enters the peaceful fold, and succeeds in turning some of the flock from their present pastor. They are organized into a feeble church. Their secession takes from the annual salary from five to ten dollars. A shanty is thrown up for a place of worship; and a minister is ordained over them. Some of this new society are in indigent circumstances; others are deeply in debt to their unitarian neighbours; all together they are unable to pay

but one third of their teacher's small salary; and but few of the number are particularly distinguished either for superior acquirements, or superior morals. In this situation, they resolve to present every family in the whole town with a religious tract on the first of each month. Agents are appointed; the work is commenced with impartiality; no individual, not even the unitarian minister, is neglected. They feel justified in spending their time and money for this purpose, when other important duties claim their attention. Such is an exact and true description; and there are doubtless many similar instances within this Commonwealth. How much modesty and humility are exhibited in such proceedings, I leave you to determine.

But this is not the worst of the case. These agents will feel themselves insulted, if you either refuse to receive their offering, or offer them a unitarian tract in return. This assertion may be illustrated by two examples. The first is this. The tract-distributor knocked at the front door of the house of a wealthy and learned unitarian Christian. He told the servant that he wished to leave a tract for the family. The gentleman overheard his remark, and politely informed him, that he felt qualified to select the reading for his own household, and was able to pay for his books. The pious saint burst into a rage, said he did not expect such treatment in a Christian land, and insisted on leaving the pamphlet. The other case is this. I passed down the Ohio river in the same steam-boat with one of your officious tract-distributors. He was frequently thrusting his dingy publications into the very face and eyes of the travellers. He was asked how he should regard the conduct of any one who refused his gratuitous offering. He said he should consider it ungentlemanly and unchristian. A unitarian tract was then offered to him. He cast his eye over the title-page, and shrunk back as from a deadly serpent. He was reminded of his former observation, and pronounced self-condemned. But neither shame nor entreaty could induce him to read a word of the heretical doctrine. He was literally obedient to the command of you leaders, who have cautioned their readers to avoid unitarian publications as they would a cup of poison. These are mere specimens of daily occurrences.

Now, Sir, would you exhibit such proceedings as the most worthy example of orthodox modesty and humility? Let me endeavour to bring this measure home to your own bosom. Suppose then a very feeble unitarian society should now be organized in your neighbourhood. Suppose it should consist of some ten or a dozen males of little education or influence or usefulness; and some twenty or thirty females. Suppose they should send you a copy of the following document: "At a meeting of the first unitarian church in South Andover the following preamble and resolves were unanimously adopted. Whereas divine Providence has surrounded us by those who have embraced soul-destroying errors, and are hastening to perdition; and whereas the Theological Seminary in this place has essentially renounced the Scriptures, and set up a human standard of religious belief; and whereas we cannot answer to our final Judge with an approving conscience, unless we do all in our power to stay this destructive heresy;—therefore resolved, that we will distribute a Christian tract to every family in this heathenish settlement on the first of each month; and also resolved, that since the divinity school on the Hill may be regarded as the fountain-head of this pernicious infidelity, we will present to every professor and student two Christian tracts on the first of each month." Suppose that on the first day of next January, while you are at breakfast, you should observe a female busybody pass by your window. Suppose one of your younger children should answer to her rap, and receive with the specified tracts, this observation: "I am the agent for distributing these religious works in this school district. Here are two for your father and the rest for the family. I hope you will all peruse them prayerfully, and that they may be blessed to your conversion to truth and godliness." Suppose she should then extend her errand of mercy to each of the students. This would serve to let you understand what is now doing at the istiga-

TENDENCY OF UNIVERSALISM.

Of all the systems which we ever proposed for the consideration of mankind, the doctrine of Universalism is unquestionably the most benevolent in its nature and tendency. Notwithstanding it has been denounced as a sentiment highly dangerous to public morals, we are confident a moment's reflection will convince the reader of the truth of what we have said. The sum of all pure religion is love. To love God with all the heart and our neighbors as ourselves, is the beginning and the end of christian duty. Dr. Priestly pertinently observed, in avowing his belief of Universalism in the church of the Universalists at Philadelphia, that this doctrine must unavoidably produce love to God, and as this was the source of every other virtue, so the sentiment must have a propitious influence upon the

general morals of mankind. If it be true, as a greater than Priestly said, that we love God because he first loved us, and if it be also true that if we love God, we shall keep his commandments, how can the favorable influence of Universalism be denied? That no system can have a stronger influence to produce love to God than that which represents him as a kind and faithful parent, forming all his purposes, and executing all his providence for the highest welfare of the human race, seems to us self-evident.

Universalists have the best opportunities of judging of the influence of their opinions. They know what effect their sentiments have upon themselves, and have carefully observed their tendency on persons recently converted to them. They never fail to soften the heart, and excite benevolence. They not only render a man better for himself, by inspiring a confidence in God, and fortifying the heart with hope, but they render him better for his fellow creatures, by warning his benumbed affections, and calling into exercise the tenderest feelings of which he is capable. We have known men parsimonious even to their own extreme inconvenience, who by being made acquainted with Universalism, became new men. They not only treated others more benevolently, but they treated themselves so. Mr. Murray relates a case of the kind in his auto-biography. We have known men distinguished for their irritability, and for ungenerous and uncandid emotions who have been softened by the doctrine of divine love, and shaped anew in the mould of the divine character; it may so speak. We recollect an instance about ten years since, in which the attention of a worldly minded man had been called up to the doctrine of the Universalists. This article will meet his eye, and he will read it, and know who is referred to—his experience may be told in a few words. He saw and he believed. His feelings were an indescribable joy, partaking freely of the nature of enthusiasm. At the time, he loved every body—he wished every body to visit him—he sought acquaintance with almost every person he met. Attending a lecture in a neighboring town, where he formed acquaintance with many whom he had not known, he led them along by the ardor of his feelings half way home with him; and on parting, he fell into tears, and exclaimed, "O how this doctrine makes me love mankind!" This was during the first year of our ministry, and it left an impression which has not yet worn away. The man's enthusiasm has now gone, but the effect of his conversion still remains; and his general character retains the features which were then given it.

Universalists ought to be the most pious and benevolent people in the world. They not only ought to be afraid, but ashamed of all sin, on account of its inconsistency with their opinions. That they are not so good as they ought to be, we are freely willing to admit; and we know the reason of it. And if the reader will give us his candid attention, we will show the reason. Universalists make their religion too much a thing of theory and too little a thing of practice. They would necessarily be the best people in the world, if they would but reduce their religious opinions to practice. Wherever these opinions are permitted to exercise their natural influence, their tendency is good. It must be so. Universalism is a doctrine of love, it is a doctrine of mercy, it is a doctrine of forgiveness, it is a doctrine of benevolence; and unless it can have an influence directly opposed to its own nature, (which is impossible) it must beget the like qualities in the heart of him who believes it. Let Universalists endeavor to regulate their conduct by a reference to their religious opinions—let them bring down their doctrine to their "business and bosom." Let it not be a matter of reflection and argument only, but a matter of conduct and conversation—the governing principle of life and action. Nothing will so quickly show that this doctrine is not of a licentious tendency, as to put it into practice, which, of all methods, is the surest by which to test any doctrine.

We beseech Universalists to take these things into consideration. It is no difficult matter to wipe away the aspersion which has been so unjustly cast upon them, that their opinions are at war with virtue. Let us make them of the contrary part ashamed, by giving them no evil thing to say of us. "Brethren, if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think of these things."—Trumpet.

There is a sermon in the following little sentence, if those who are toiling for fame and influence would but stop and consider it. How strange that when the road to the heart is so plain and easy by kind offices and the uniform exercises of benevolence and good nature, so few are travelling in it, while all are struggling to gain the good opinion of the world! "Talents may strike, genius may dazzle, learning may astonish, and power may awe, but kindness of heart will win universal esteem and love, and is the cheapest mode of gaining a lasting hold in the affections and remembrance of mankind."

THE INTELLIGENCER.

—“And Truth diffuse her radiance from the Press.”

GARDNER, FRIDAY, JANUARY 21.

DEMONOLOGICAL CREEDS.

There can be no doubt, we think, that the modern system of demonology has an intimate connexion with the mythology of the ancients. The creed of Zoroaster—that which occurs to unassisted reason as the most natural mode of accounting for the mingled existence of good and evil in the visible world, by the supposition of two co-existent and independent principles, the one benevolent and the other malevolent—was received into most of the heathen nations of antiquity; and after the earliest ages of Christianity, when it became the religion of the empire and inducements of a temporal nature were held out to induce the heathen to assume its profession, it is very easy to conceive how the converts, thus hastily and conveniently made, should bring into the church much of that creed and many of the superstitions which it cherished. Indeed there are feelings incident to the human heart, or diseases to which it is liable, which have disposed the mind to embrace a belief of supernatural demons, and which in some cases have induced such believers to pay their vows and adorations to their altars. The sailor, who, in the face of a violent storm, lustily and fervently prayed alternately to “Good Lord” and to “good devil,” in the hope of pre-engaging the favor of him into whose hands he should happen finally to fall, is not the only one who has thought it necessary to reverence with awe and dread his fantastic majesty.—“Such is the pendency of human nature,” says Sir Walter Scott “that many will neglect the altar of the Author of all Good rather than that of the Arimanes, trusting with indifference to the well known mercy of the one, while they shrink from the idea of irritating the vengeful jealousy of the awful father of evil.”

Accordingly the mythology of the ancients, while it provided a multitude of deities to suit the wants and superstitions of the times, also enjoined the worship of these infernal deities. And the modern belief in demonology, which can be easily accounted for as before hinted, evidently holds an intimate connexion with heathen mythology upon the subject. The “form without form” ascribed to infernal spirits in the present day is no caricature of the Grecian Pan, and the Paltie Nickas or Old Nick. The earliest map or chart ever published, which was engraved at Rome towards the close of the 15th century, *fac similes* of which are yet in existence, represents the inhabitants of Lithuania, Esthonia and other districts then mostly unknown to the civilized world, as doing homage to the demons of the spiritual world. Those demons are exactly painted as having cloven feet, bats’ wings, saucer eyes, locks like a serpent, and tails like dragons. The cloven foot is the attribute of Pan, to whose talents for inspiring terror, so useful in the orthodox system of proselytism, we owe the word *panic*; and the snaky tresses no doubt are borrowed from the shield of Minerva. The belief of different ancient heathen nations on the subject of demons, however, though it agreed in all its essential particulars, is very near akin to the modern notions on the subject. To this day the cloven foot, the bats’ wings, the snaky tresses and the dragon’s tail are preserved in all orthodox accounts of the father of evil. The wonder is that people should not see, or seeing, that they should not cast out the whole wreck of the Roman Pantheon from the temple of Christianity. That many of the heathen notions were early introduced into christianism—greatly corrupting the doctrine of the gospel—is indisputable. It takes time, we know, to outgrow such corruptions—and especially in the world unwilling to give up what vibrates so sensibly on all the fearful and marvellous propensities of our nature;—but really we think a score or two of centuries ought to be enough for the triumphs of heathen mythology and superstitious credulity. We boast of *light and freedom* in this age. It would be well for the world if men would open their eyes to that light, and exercise the liberty of rejecting from their faith all the absurdities of the ancient heathen.

DIVINITY OF THE SAVIOUR.

It will be admitted by the enemies of the deity of the Saviour, that it is a right conclusion that the “Son of man” is man. So it is not unreasonable, but on the contrary, the dictate of sound reason, that the “Son of God” must be God.

We cut the above out of last week’s *Zion’s Advocate*, in which paper we find it credited to the “*Christian Intelligencer*.” It can hardly be necessary for us to express the hope, that no one will charge such logic to our account. The “*Christian Intelligencer*,” from which the above must have been taken, is a new orthodox paper recently established in New York. We expected when we learned that our name had been assumed by those people, to have frequent occasion for mortification, lest articles circulated in other papers credited to that, should be supposed to have originated in our own. But we have a remark or two to make upon the logic which Mr. Wilson has approved.

“It will be admitted by the enemies of the deity of the Saviour.” This is a method of slandering by *style* which is common in most orthodox prints,—as if Unitarians were not only *opposed* to, but actually the *enemies* of, some attribute which truly and confessedly belongs to Jesus Christ!—in other words, as if they were professedly the enemies of our blessed Saviour! Why could not these gentlemen have employed a style which would express *truth* instead of falsehood, and said—“It will be admitted by Unitarians,” or “those who are opposed to the doctrine that Christ is the Eternal Father Almighty,” or something of the like? But let that pass now. To have stated a term in the syllogism which would authorize the very “reasonable conclusion” which the writer labors to get at, he should have said (what is false by the way)—“It is admitted by Unitarians that it is a right conclusion that the ‘Son of man’ is the very father which beget him.” Then he might have added the “reasonable” trinitarian conclusion—“So it is the dictate of sound reason, that the ‘Son of God’ must be the very God whose Son he was.” Mr. Wilson will please “put that and that together,” and see how much the sum amounts to, only let him not be so un-mathematical as to say “three times one are one.”

Under the head of “*Revivals*” we find three accounts in the last Baptist Advocate, in the course of which a great boasting is made that several Universalists have given up their belief and embraced Calvinism—or to use a style which the editor of that paper must approve, have denied the goodness of God and embraced him as a partial being. One account

is from China, in which it is said—“Several in this and the adjoining town of Albion, who had for some time embraced universal sentiments, have been brought to renounce the same and embrace the religion of Jesus Christ.” (C) We have so often heard stories about the renunciation of Universalism, and have so generally ascertained such stories to be untrue, that we have but a little faith in this statement. At least, though we reside quite near neighbors to those towns, the fact—if it be such—is altogether new to us. Will some friend on the ground let us know the *truth*?

The second is an account of a revival in Skaneateles, N. Y. It is said that of the whole number of converts (from 20 to 50) “two of them had been Universalists, or bordering on that sentiment.” No doubt they are worth more than the other fifty.

The third relates to Auburn, N. Y. And of this place it is said—“One young lady who has been a Universalist has been brought to rejoice in the harmony of the justice and mercy of God.” (What, on the orthodox system? The truth is, there is no system besides the Universalist in which the justice and mercy of God are harmonized—in all others these attributes are opposed.) “Also one profane drunkard has given up his morning and evening drama.” Here is a very decent classification indeed—“a young lady” and “a profane drunkard.” The orthodox are welcome to the latter, only let them treat the former with some “justice and mercy,” and not render her a maniac.

LOVE AND FEAR.

A clergyman wishing to illustrate the difference between a religion which is prompted by love, and a religion which is the fruit of fear, recently related the following to his hearers:

Last summer, as I was travelling some distance from home, I saw a man in a field who appeared to labor unusually hard, stopping every moment or two and casting his eyes towards the sun. “You seem to work very hard, friend?”—“What is the cause of so much extra exertion?” He replied, “My master is a severe man, and I am trying to get all this done before noon to save myself from a whipping.” Passing on a little farther, he discovered another laborer apparently as hard, or even harder, at work. “What makes you work so hard my friend?” said I to him. “Why,” he replied, “my master is a very benevolent and kind man; and I am trying to do all I can as a testimony of my respect and affection for him.” Here, said the preacher, is the real difference between those christians who believe God to be cruel and those who believe him to be benevolent.

It affords us pleasure to present “*Irenius*” to the reader this week. Several Letters from the same able pen are received and will appear, one each week, till the whole are published. While such writers as “*Medicus*” and “*Irenius*” favor us with their contributions, the subscriber will be very willing that the room appropriated to editorial matter be small.

DEDICATION.

On Wednesday the 5th inst. the new meeting house erected by Rev. E. Leonard’s parish at Annie Square, Gloucester, Mass. was dedicated to the God of the whole earth. The services were performed in the following order. Introductory Prayer by Br. H. Ballou of Boston. Reading of the Scriptures by Br. L. R. Paige of Sandy Bay. Dedictory prayer by Br. Thomas Jones of Gloucester. Sermon by Br. T. Whitmore of Cambridge, from Acts xv. 24, 25. Concluding Prayer and Benediction by Br. E. Leonard. These services were interspersed with appropriate music.

The house was filled to excess during the performance. Speaking of the Parish, for whose use the house is built, the editor of the *Trumpet* says:

The present state of the parish may be contemplated with the highest emotions of pleasure and gratitude. When their present pastor, Br. E. Leonard, was settled over them, some twenty-five years since, he was orthodox in his opinions. On his conversion to Universalism, his connexion with the parish was not broken up. He has since lived among them, an honest man, avowing and preaching his real opinions. The former Meeting House had stood one hundred and two years. The vote to remove it, and rebuild, has passed; the new house is erected; the pews are all sold, and no difference of opinion has divided the parish. We speak this to their honor. At the auction every pew was sold in less than two hours; every one brought more than the appraisal; and if we rightly recollect, they sold for the total sum of one thousand dollars above the cost of the house. In how few instances, in this time of building Meeting houses, can this be said? May the divine blessing continue to rest on our brethren in that place.

BALFOUR’S REPLY TO STUART.

By the following notice, which we are requested to copy, it will be seen that Br. Balfour’s Reply to Prof. Stuart’s “*Esoteric Essays*” is forth coming.

NOTICE.

Br. WHITMORE:—Permit me through your useful paper, to give the following notice to your readers. My reply to Professor Stuart’s “*Esoteric Essays on several words relating to future punishment*,” is just going to press. As I have issued no proposals, it may be proper to give the following account of my publication: 1st. Mr. Stuart’s book contains 156 pages, 12 mo, and is sold at 75 cents in boards. I am unable to state what number of pages my book shall contain, but it shall not exceed his in price. It shall greatly exceed him in the quantity of matter.

2d. As many may read my book, who have not read his, I shall quote all his principal statements, in his own words, and reply to them. No statement of any importance, where there is a difference of opinion between us, shall be omitted. I shall nearly print an edition of his book. I wish to afford my readers both sides of this question, and leave them to judge for themselves. I am confident no man, not even Mr. Stuart himself, will say I omit anything of the least importance in his book. Of the nature of my reply to his statements, others must judge.

3d. Mr. Stuart’s book is composed of five essays. The first is on the terms, *Aion* and *Aionios*, rendered everlasting and

forever in the New Testament. The four others, are on the words *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Tartarus*, and *Gehenna*, rendered pit, grave, and Hell, in the common version. To each of these Essays I devote one Letter, addressed to Mr. Stuart, personally.

4th. One great object with me, throughout my reply, is to show, Mr. Stuart has abandoned his own published rules of scripture interpretation, in his present publication. It is by his own rules, I proceed to show his statements incorrect, and that if he acted on them, as he has done in his other writings, he ought to be a Universalist. I shall make quotations from his present book and his other publications, satisfactorily to show this. We think it will also be shown, that my reply to his book, is conducted by his own rules of scripture investigation, as exemplified in his own controversial writings.

If nothing unforeseen occurs, my book will be ready for sale, early in February, 1831. As it must involve me in considerable unexpected expense, all persons who have money in their hands, arising from the sale of my former publications, are earnestly requested to remit it without delay. Such as wish me well, and are friendly to my publication, will without doubt attend to this immediately.

W. BALFOUR.

Charleston, Jan. 1, 1831.

In copying Mr. Whitman’s remarks to Prof. Stuart on the subject of the distribution of orthodox tracts, on our first page, the following lines, which comes in at the close of the article, were accidentally omitted. I hope you will seriously meditate upon this statement, and let us know how much modesty and humility would be indicated by such an undertaking. I know of no way of bringing this business home to your people but by returning the compliment.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

[For the Christian Intelligencer.]

THOUGHTS ON DIVINE AGENCY, IN A COURSE OF LETTERS TO A FRIEND.

LETTER I.

MY DEAR FRIEND:—Among the various topics which philosophy or even inspiration presents for our consideration, there is none perhaps of more magnitude or importance, than that of the reality and eternity of Divine Agency both in the moral and physical universe; and it is a subject of great satisfaction to observe the happy coincidence of opinion which has generally prevailed among the more enlightened parts of mankind upon this momentous doctrine. For it is found that wherever the Existence of a *Supreme Being* is admitted, under whatever name or notion, his providence or agency is also admitted, as the necessary result of his attributes and perfections, and is regarded as the sole guarantee of protection and safety, amid the clashing interests and tendencies of things. So that it may be safely affirmed, that there is one philosophical fact, or if you please, one religious dogma, which has been sanctioned by the universal suffrage of mankind. For long before the light of Divine Revelation had irradiated the world, philosophy had fully established and clearly illustrated this important point. It was seen from the immobility of matter, contrasted with the endless variety of complicated motions, and tendencies of bodies, that there must be some living conscious invisible Agent, diffused through the universe, and so intimately present with every particle of matter which it contained, as to constitute the *spring of action* to the whole machine of Nature. The omniscience of Deity necessarily precludes all transition of time or place—He must necessarily fill immensity and eternity—with Him all space is as a point, and eternity but as a moment! Or as the scriptures express it, “with Him a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years!” Miserable is that philosophy which would represent an Infinite Mind pushing its researches into futurity, foreseeing distant events, and devising, or permitting them, to come forward into real existence; for with the same impulse such a Being must comprehend and control all events in the universe or in eternity. For as He realizes no succession of time, and no change of place, no one object can be nearer to him than another, nor any one event more remote than another. With him nothing can be past and nothing can be future—but an *eternal now*, must constitute the only tense with Deity.

It was with such a view of the Almighty Author and Parent of nature that the Psalmist so beautifully exclaims “Whither shall I go from thy spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend into Heaven thou art there; If I make my bed in Hell, behold thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and reside in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thine hand lead me and thy right hand guide me. If I say surely the darkness shall cover me; even the night shall be light about me. Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day; the darkness and the light are both alike to thee. For thou hast possessed my reins; thou hast covered me in my mother’s womb. I will praise thee for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; marvelous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well. My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eye did see my substance, yet being imperfect, and in thy book were all my members written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there were none of them.”

But while mankind with one consent, subscribe to the doctrine of Divine Agency in the physical system of the world,

many seem to doubt, and some utterly to deny its control over the moral faculties of man; and seem to fear that, the all-gracious *Being*, who has shewn such infinite care and wisdom in the management of the mere machine of nature, as not to suffer a “mote to fly in the air, or a sparrow to light upon the ground without his notice” has abandoned the moral system to the mere direction of chance! That after creating a race of beings in his own image and breathing into them, the attribute of his own immortality; He has like the unnatural Ostrich (which deposits her eggs in the sand and there leaves them, as chance shall direct, either to be hatched by the sun, or to be crushed under foot) abandoned them to the casualty of irreparable ruin! But when we contemplate the immortal Principle within us, and contrast its relative value and importance with that of mere unconscious matter, we are compelled to believe that it would have been better for our Great Creator, to have abandoned the whole external frame of nature—to have left the elements to clash and subside—the planets to dash against each other and dissolve—the Sun to lose its lustre and send out its last ray upon a benighted world—and in a word, the whole external universe to fall into ruin, or into nothing, than to leave one immortal Soul, to stagger from the path of rectitude, and fall into irreparable ruin. IRENIUS.

[For the Christian Intelligencer.]

THOUGHTS ON THE MENTAL & PHYSICAL CONSTITUTION OF MAN, CLOSING WITH AN ENQUIRY INTO THE NATURE AND ORIGIN OF CERTAIN MENTAL EXERCISES IMPROPERLY CALLED RELIGIOUS.

NO. 5.

If it be admitted, that there is no animal whose brain is a precise counterpart to that of man, yet there appears to be so many points of resemblance, even upon a slight examination, as to induce a full conviction, that a similarity of function was the design in all. The brain of brute animals like that of the human kind, has the same convoluted, glandular appearance; the same soft, pulpy, tender consistence, and more or less defended by a strong covering. Those who might be disposed to object to this natural inference; (that is, of denying similarity of function, from similarity in structure,) by the same parity of reasoning, ought to doubt of the faculties of sight and hearing in brutes, though possessed of organs, apparently for that purpose, and quite analogous to those in man. It is not a little surprising, that the action of the brain, in producing thought, should be deemed inadequate to its design in man, without the supposed additional endowment of an immortal principle, which is usually denied to brutes; yet admit a similarity of function in other organs pertaining to both, when the why and the wherefore, (to use a trite phrase) relating to the exercise of the latter, is just as far from human comprehension, as the phenomena of intellect exhibited in the former, with, or without the addition of any such principle.

It can no more be explained, why the Optic Nerve should be peculiarly affected by the action of light, so as to cause what is denominated sight, than it can be demonstrated, why or how the brain should be thus acted upon by its own appropriate stimuli, so as to cause the necessary phenomena of thought. The same remark may be applied to every other organ of sense, as well as to those of nutrition and assimilation.

An acknowledged inability, to account for the effects which so uniformly follow the application of the appropriate stimuli to these various organs, does not affect the controversy in question. We are only considering the *facts* relating to mind, as an effect, depending upon known causes, without attempting to explain the secret operation of those causes in fulfilling the laws by which they are controlled.

Among the multiplied proofs which comparative Anatomy every where presents to confirm our views, the facts are clear and unequivocal. It is within the capacity of almost any person to discover, and every candid opponent will, at least, acknowledge the force of argument, derived from this source. For if it be admitted, that the known organs of sense, common to both the human and brute species, presenting a similarity of structure, were likewise designed for a similar purpose in the economy of both; it must then be acknowledged as very remarkable, that the brain should afford the only exception.—Inasmuch that a foreign agent is found necessary to aid in perfecting its object in one case, but rejected in the other.

In all vertebral animals, especially, (that is having a spine or backbone,) including man, seeing, hearing, feeling, smelling and tasting, are all constituted with the most striking resemblance; are so far as we know, influenced and excited in the same manner, and by the same causes.—And the impressions thus made upon those senses are transmitted in like manner to a common sensorium, for some purpose.—Now if this sensorium in one species, responds to those impressions communicated to it, so as to exhibit the faculties of thought, without the aid of an extraneous immortal principle, it may equally subserve a corresponding purpose in another.

By pursuing this inquiry, and connecting the few facts already brought to view from the rich stores of comparative Anatomy; it will be easily understood, how the force of thought, (or what is perhaps the same,) the different degrees of intelligence should be so infinitely varied, not only among animals, having certain characters, distinctive of their species, but also among that of the same kind. It was supposed by Aristotle, that the human Brain was

larger in proportion to the size of the body, than that of any other animal. And on this supposed difference of ratio, he predicated the different degrees of intelligence, so very striking throughout the animal kingdom. Observations have since, however, shown this conclusion to be incorrect. For the brain of the ape kind is found to bear as large a proportion to that of the body, as the human; and even in some birds still larger. For example, the average weight of the brain in man to that of the body is about 1-27th part. In the Elephant 1-100th, Dog 1-101, Sparrow 1-25, Canary-bird 1-14. Hence it is obvious from this limited comparison, and numerous others might be added, that the principle does not hold good. Another one, therefore, has been adopted, which appears more satisfactory, as observation has not yet shewn it to be incorrect, viz. the larger the brain of any animal in proportion to the whole mass of nerves given off, the more intelligence is thereby indicated.

The bulk of nerves peculiar to some animals, is found to be ten times that of man; while the weight of the brain, in the same animal, is not more than one half of the average weight of the human.—The horse, according to Dr. Good will afford a proper specimen in the foregoing comparison, though the brain of that noble animal, will hardly exceed 1 lb. 4 oz.; while in man the smallest will be found not much less than 2 lb. 6 oz. Though the relative weight of the brain, compared with the aggregate bulk of nerves given off, in the same animal may furnish a pretty correct index to the degree of intellectual power, peculiar to a whole species; yet to account for the precise differences existing amongst animals of the same species, would need other comparisons, depending on the relative proportions of the various organs, and parts of the same organ, requiring more accurate discrimination than has ever yet been made; though discriminations founded on such comparisons have of late been attempted.*

The exceptions, however, are not numerous, in which other animals, have a brain as large in proportion to the size of the body as man. This fact becomes more obvious as we descend upon the scale of organic life. After leaving the higher order of animals, whose brain, in this respect is nearly a counterpart to that of man; we discover this gland to lessen in its relative size to that of the body, and also to the general mass of nerves arising from it, maintaining every variety of proportion, through innumerable gradations, till it finally loses every vestige of brain, leaving only a spiral marrow and its nervous appendages. And lastly in some few classes of worms, this last endowment is wholly wanting. In some animals of a lower grade this nervous chord, or spiral marrow, is found destitute of its common long covering; “And such” observes Dr. Good, “is actually the conformation of the nervous system in insects, and for the most part in worms; neither of which, are possessed of a cranium or spine; and in none of which, are we able to trace, more than a slight enlargement of the superior part of the nervous chord, or spiral marrow, as it is called in other animals,—a part situated near the mouth, and apparently intended to correspond with the organ of a brain.”

“In zoophytic worms, we can scarcely trace any distinction of structure, and are totally unable to recognise a nervous system of any kind.” He then goes on to make the inquiry—“can we, then, conceive that all these different kinds and orders and classes of animals, thus differently organized and differently endowed with intelligence” are possessed of an equality of corporeal feeling? or to adopt the language of the poet, that—

“the poor worm than treadest upon,
In corporal suffering, feels a pang as great
As when a giant dies?”

One remark, especially, in the preceding quotation, comes very happily to our aid. The Dr. here admits of the endowment of an intellectual capacity, to every grade of living beings, constituted with an organ which serves the purpose of a brain, however imperfect in its development.

In another place the same writer very justly observes, that “as simple nerves, or a nervous cord, such as that of the spinal marrow, is the proper organ of sensation or feeling; the (gland of a) brain, is the proper organ of intelligence;—and the degree of intelligence appears in every instance we are acquainted with, to be proportioned, not indeed to the size of the brain, as compared to that of the animal to which it belongs, as was conjectured by Aristotle, and has been the general belief, almost to the present day; but as compared with the aggregate mass of nerves that issue from it. The larger the brain, and the less the nerves, the higher and more comprehensive the intelligence; the smaller the brain and the larger the nerves, the duller and more contracted.”

It ought to be observed here, that the terms, intelligence, mind, intellectual principle, principle of thought, &c. have

* Drs. Gall and Spurzheim, within a few years past, have excited much attention among the French Physiologists especially, by introducing a new theory on these subjects. They attempt to shew on Physiognomy, that the peculiar character and temperament of individuals, depend upon the different proportions which the several parts of the brain bear to each other. It is argued that the animal square, and all the varieties of feeling, have each a distinct origin in the brain; and that the moral qualities, the virtues and vices of the individual, are distinctly marked by peculiarities in the configuration of the skull.

Some of their views as might be expected, have been represented as visionary, while others are admitted physiologically correct. That the character and temperament of every individual, is continually under the influence of physical causes, acting directly or indirectly, whereby “nature is bound in fate” there can be no doubt, though the freedom of the will may be maintained by its own acquired powers, accordingly designed for such exalted purposes.

in conformity to common acceptance, been used by Dr. Good synonymously with the term *soul*, as understood in its most popular signification, that is, the immortal part of man. If this is not their most obvious meaning, we should be at a loss to conjecture what is. From all these facts, the conclusion is irresistible, that there is not only a similarity of structure in the organs of sense, commencing with the most perfect of the human species, and passing through every grade of vital existence, to the less perfect classes of animals, but there is also a similarity of function pertaining to the same organs, in all. And hence if mind be the result of organization in one species of animals, it must be so in another, and that the manifestations of thought, or intellect in all, depend also on a common cause. And this cause probably rests on the inscrutable laws of vitality, as will be shown hereafter, independent of the aid of an *immortal, immaterial principle*, to which is ascribed consciousness of existence, when freed from the trammels of gross organic matter.

In opposition to this, we are induced to believe in the existence of things only that the mind is something, matter if you please. And here we are happy to return our thanks to Dr. Good for another concession in favor of our views, though at the time, it might have been expressed, with feelings of pleasantry, that in the idea of a material soul, there was something, "solid, substantial, alderman-like; a real spirit of animation, fond of good cheer, and good company." Now why indulge in this sort of ridicule about a material soul, when the opposing doctrine so gracefully imputes to the immaterial spirit, when disembodied, dimensions and figure, cognizable at least by one sense and hence we often hear, "of Apparition horrid, tall and ghastly, (and strange to tell)"

"Vanishes at the crowing of the cock."

That the human soul, mind or intellects may be composed of material ideas, yet not subject to the examination of the senses, renders their existence no more improbable, than that of gravitation or chemical affinity. We may be able to demonstrate the existence of a thing; yet be wholly ignorant of its mode of existence. Again our learned author graciously affirms, in another place, when speaking of the essence of the soul, "that no question has been productive of so little satisfaction, and for the obvious reason, that we have no distinct idea of the terrors, and no settled foundation to build upon: that materiality, and immateriality, are equally beyond our reach, because they convey no distinct meaning to the mind."

Such an inference is unquestionably true in regard to the latter, but cannot be so in regard to the former. Now this is a very extraordinary syllogism, for so logical a scholar as Dr. Good. How does it appear then? Why, because we know nothing of the essence of that which has no existence only in name; therefore we are alike ignorant of the essence of what does really exist, and hence our senses inform us as much about the one as the other.

Such a mode of reasoning must be acknowledged very fallacious. Why talk about the essence of immateriality. The conclusion was natural enough, that where there is nothing, there is no settled premises to build on. But it does not follow of course, that we know nothing of things material, and "have no premises to build on," where there is a sufficiency of the substantial on hand. The truth is, in whatever light we contemplate matter, whether we comprehend its mode of existence, or not, we cannot be destitute of premises to erect a superstructure, containing some facts in relation to it, from the united testimony of our senses. That we have distinct ideas of materiality, though we may not fully comprehend the essential properties belonging to it, will be doubted by very few. Nor is it necessary in acknowledging the mind's materiality, that its essence should be analyzed, and fully comprehended, any more than those belonging to other objects of sense. Neither is it necessary to demonstrate why the several senses are so formed as to receive impressions, by external objects, which are thence transmitted to the mental organ.

It is sufficient to demonstrate the simple fact, that the senses are thus influenced, and through them the brain is excited to perform its appropriate function. The limited view we have thus taken of the origin of mind, if rightly understood, will be found to harmonize with those of the ablest writers upon its powers and capacities, at the head of which is the system of Mr. Locke. This lucid writer (for he makes a dark subject plain) rejects in the outset the absurdity of innate ideas, and fixes the true source of all our ideas to the excitement produced in the brain through the medium of a sentient apparatus, by external objects; and by the perception of ideas from the exercise of its own faculties. The former called ideas of sensation, the latter ideas of reflection.

These two sources then, of all knowledge and experience, constitute the thinking soul, both of man and brutes. But tradition has affixed a never-dying essence to the former, on which false foundation, is erected numerous soul-saving doctrines and institutions, beneficial only to their seemingly devoted advocates; but fatal in their consequences to the improvement of moral virtue; stifling to every pious effusion of a thankful heart, and subversive of every exalted conception, in the wisdom and goodness, of an all merciful God.

MEDICUS.

FARMINGTON TEMPERANCE SOCIETY

The gentlemen who have sent us the following for insertion are right in their belief that the Editor is friendly to the object which they have in view in wishing for its publication. In a desire for the suppression of intemperance and indeed a wish to promote the cause of virtue and religion in every other respect, we yield to none.

It may not be indecorous for us to add the hope that no one will conclude from the following facts, that Farmington is, or has been, more under the curse of the "fell monster," than most other towns throughout the country. Facts on this subject as existing in most places, if they were called out, would appear appalling. A former residence of several years in Farmington enables us to speak favorably of the general character of the people for sobriety, intelligence and hospitality.

[For the Christian Intelligencer.]

The following statement of facts in regard to the sales of ardent spirit in the town of Farmington, was exhibited before the Temperance Society in said town by one of its members, at their annual Meeting Jan. 4th, 1831.

The amount of ardent spirit of all kinds, sold during the year 1826 in the town of Farmington, as ascertained by reference to the bills of purchase by the several traders, was 8666 gallons; and its cost, at the average price of 58 cents per gallon nearly, is 5029 dollars and 82 cents. If to this sum be added 10 per cent, cost of transportation and 25 per cent more, as advance to the seller, the cost to the consumers would be 6790 dollars and 55 cents.

Now, as it is generally admitted that this falls considerably short of the actual amount, sold in town that year, there having been considerable quantities sold of which no bills were preserved, suppose the number of gallons sold to have been 10,000, (which probably would not exceed the truth,) and the cost to the consumers would amount to 7830 dollars. For the past year 1830, the quantity has probably been more accurately ascertained, and is found to be 5640 gallons; which, at an average cost paid of 50 cents per gallon, together with the advance to the consumers, would amount to 3307 dollars. Now if we take into view the increase of population since 1826, and if sales of ardent spirit had been in the same proportion the past year as they were in 1826, there would have been sold 11,000 gallons at a cost of 8613 dollars, during the last 12 months. And in the last five years 52,500 gallons would have been sold amounting to 41,107 dollars. But if we take the two years upon which our calculations have been made as a criterion for the intermediate years, there have been sold in this town during the last five years 39,100 gallons, making a total diminution in that period of 13,400 gallons, amounting to 9768 dollars; and as the inhabitants of the town are supposed to consume to the amount of one half of the ardent spirit sold in it, there has of course been a saving of expense in this one article of 4884 dollars within the last five years, that is, the inhabitants of Farmington are 4884 dollars richer than they would have been, had there not been such influence exerted upon public opinion by the friends of Temperance and Temperance Societies, to say nothing of the expense of law suits, time spent in grog shops, and pauperism, together with those numberless evils both physical and moral, which doubtless have been diminished in as great a degree as their prolific cause. Who then will say that it is useless to form Temperance Societies and become members of them when such is the result? If we take a further view of the subject, and make the last five years a data for the ten years past, and one half of that sum for the ten years preceding, and one fourth for the ten years preceding those, which it is presumed will fall below the truth, we shall find that we have expended for ardent spirit in this town during the last thirty years a little short of 50,000 dollars; which sum, had it been put at interest, as the rate of 6 per cent per annum, annually, as it had accumulated each year, would now have amounted to 101,550 dollars, a sum which would produce an annual income to the town of 6093 dollars, being more than twice the sum necessary to pay all our town, county, State, and parish taxes, including also, the annual expense of supporting the several Bridges across Sandy river in said town, which has ever been considered a grievous burthen, and the inhabitants scarcely able to support it. But the inhabitants virtually pay the above tax of 6093 dollars, for having gratified their appetites in the use of this "baleful article," which has been the means of "scattering firebrands, arrows and death" far and wide, among this, otherwise peaceable community. Yes, Intemperance has stalked abroad through our streets by day and by night, singling out its victims from among almost all classes of our citizens; it has entered the domestic abode, and, in several instances, laid its fell grasp on the father of a young and promising family; severed the ties of conjugal affection, obliterated the tender sympathies of a parent and implanted the malignant passions of a demon, and has at last left a weeping wife and fatherless children to mourn the untimely, the sudden, and awful death of its victim! Many others are still suffering from its direful influence; and, unless speedily rescued from its strong hold, will meet a similar fate.

Should we be startled at such a picture, and such calculations, and begin to regret that measures had not sooner been taken to accomplish so much good, and prevent so great evil. Let us redeem the time by doing all in our power to banish this evil from our town; for, although perhaps but

few towns in the State have consumed less ardent spirit than this, in proportion to the number of its inhabitants, yet we are far behind many neighboring towns in the good cause of temperance. If we should continue to consume as much ardent spirit for thirty years to come annually, as we have the last year, (increasing only in proportion to the increase of population) it would amount with interest as above, to 195,657 dollars, and would at the end of that period, produce an annual income to the rising generation of 11,739 dollars. This is no fiction, it is the result of mathematical certainty, neither is it impossible to accomplish this great good, and prevent so much evil; for we have a practical demonstration in the lives of hundreds in this town that ardent spirit is unnecessary.

THE CHRONICLE.

"And catch the manners living as they rise."

GARDINER, FRIDAY, JANUARY 21, 1831.

CENSUS OF MAINE.

The Marshal of Maine has furnished the Legislature with a copy of the late census. The following abstract is all that has yet been published. We have added the census of 1820 and exhibit the gain in each county.

	1820.	1830.	gain.	percentage of gain.
York,	46,283	51,710	5,427	11 1/2
Cumberland,	49,445	60,113	10,668	21 1/2
Oxford,	27,104	35,217	8,113	33 1/2
Kennebec,	40,149	52,491	12,342	30 3/4
Lincoln,	46,843	57,181	10,338	22
Somerset,	21,775	35,709	13,934	64
Penobscot,	13,370	31,530	17,660	127
Hancock,	17,836	24,317	6,481	36 1/3
Waldo,	22,279	29,790	7,511	33 3/4
Washington,	12,744	21,295	8,551	66 3/4
Total,	298,322	399,383	101,061	

Per centage of gain in the State, 34, nearly.

In the foregoing there are included 189 who are deaf and dumb, 163 blind, 1,146 blacks and 2,830 aliens.

If 50,000 be adopted as the ratio of representation in Congress, it appears by the above, that we shall not be entitled to any more representatives than we now have, but will be left with a very large fraction, viz. 49,383, unrepresented. It seems to be generally supposed however, that a lower ratio will be adopted, as the results of the late census in many other States, show that those States will also be left with very large unrepresented fractions. By that ratio, Rhode Island would be deprived of half of her present representation and lose a fraction of 49,000—Connecticut would also lose one, and have about 49,000 unrepresented. New York too, would lose a large fraction—about 40,000—Vermont 20,000—and some of the southern and western States would suffer in the same degree.

It is calculated that about 20 per cent, in ten years is the rate of natural increase in New England. It appears therefore, that Maine is the only State in New England which has retained its natural increase and in addition to this it appears, that she has received an accession of 4 per cent or 12,000, by immigration from other States in the last 10 years. Maine has probably now received an impulse, which in the next ten years will give her a much greater accession of numbers, and of wealth, than the last 10 has exhibited. It is a rational presumption that the year 1840 will find Maine with a population of at least 550,000. Much however will depend upon the policy and the wisdom of our State government for that period. If judicious measures are adopted to promote the settlement of the vacant lands and the improvement of her internal resources by roads, canals, &c. this anticipation will doubtless be fully realized. Hitherto, but little attention has been paid to these important objects; and the mode of disposing of our public lands seem to have tended to retard the extension of our settlements. The soil of Maine, as a whole, is thought to be more fertile than that of any other New England State, and there is no good reason to doubt, that in this respect it is equal to New York. Yet, while New York exports a large amount of bread stuffs annually, Maine imports a very large proportion of her annual consumption. We can see no good reason why Maine should not be able to produce her own bread stuff if the cultivation of her agricultural resources should receive that attention which their importance merits.

Georgia and the Indians.—The Supreme Court of Georgia, having sentenced a Cherokee Indian to death, under the authority of the laws of that State, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the U. S. on the 22d inst. caused a citation to be served on the Governor of Georgia summoning that State to appear before the Supreme Court of the U. S. in Washington on the 2d Monday in January inst. to show cause why the judgment rendered against the said Indian should not be corrected. On this the Governor immediately sent a communication to the Legislature, denying the right of the U. S. to interfere, and expressing his determination to resist any such interference by force. The Legislature responded to the same sentiments and authorized and required the Gov. to reject any invasion upon the administration of the laws of the State. What will be the end of these things? Are we coming to civil war and division?

SHOCKING ACCIDENT.—We have to record an accident of a distressing nature which occurred in this village on Wednesday. A young man named Leonard Guptain, about 17 years old, who was employed in the Cabinet shop of Mr. J. Nudd, as a Turner, accidentally got his foot entangled in a band, that moved the machinery, which was passing round an upright shaft and making two or three hundred revolutions a minute, and he was whirled with frightful rapidity many times round the shaft, dashing his head and limbs against the post and a grindstone. Before the wheel could be stopped life was extinct and the unfortunate young man presented a dreadful sight. His skull was broken, limbs shattered and his whole frame shockingly mangled. None but those possessed of iron nerves could look upon the bruised corpse with anything like composure. Accidents of a similar kind are not unfrequent, and they should operate as a caution to those who are employed in machine shops, factories &c. to use great circumspection. Perhaps the utmost care will not always avail to prevent disasters, but it might lessen them. The manner in which the above catastrophe was occasioned, we learn was thus.—There was a band which passed from a drum on the shaft to a grindstone; which band had slipped from its place, by dropping down. Guptain, it is thought put one of his feet under the band to press it up to its place, when he became entangled, as before stated. He was probably killed instantaneously.

CONGRESS. A resolution was offered by Mr. Hayne of Georgia in the House, instructing the Committee on Ways and Means to inquire into the expediency of reducing the duties on sugar. The house voted, 89 to 85, to consider the resolution. A Resolution offered by Mr. Trezant of Va. instructing the same Committee to report a bill to reduce the existing duties on imported goods to take effect after the payment of the public debt, so as to raise a revenue adequate to the support of the Government under an economical administration of its affairs, was *negatived*, 73 to 111. The Gov. of Georgia has transmitted to the Senate, through the Vice President, a copy of Resolutions recently passed by the Legislature of that State, instructing her Senators and requesting her Representatives to oppose any measures which may be proposed for the promotion of Internal Improvements.

Mr. Wingate of Maine offered a Resolution on the 10th inst. instructing the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of making appropriations for the removal of obstructions in, and improving the channel of the Cathance river.

MACOMBER'S IMPROVED HATS. It gives us pleasure to learn that Mr. Macomber's new mode of preparing the bodies of Hats and Caps, attracts a good deal of public attention; and as far as it has been seen and examined, receives the public approbation.—We have noticed however, that some of the papers in speaking of the Hats, &c. have called them *Indian Rubber Hats*, as though they were made altogether of that material. This is a misconception. This substance is merely used as a substitute for the glue and shellac which has heretofore constituted the stiffening material of hats. Mr. Macomber's hats, as it regards their external appearance, are in no wise different from other heavier or nappier hats. A Philadelphia paper queries whether they will not lose their elastic property under a summer's sun. We understand, that in Hats for summer wear, Mr. M. combines some other substance with the Rubber, which it is thought will obviate the supposed objection.

REMARKABLE.—Maine seems to have changed her position on the globe with some of the middle states. A fortnight ago there was good sleighing from Boston to Baltimore—and according to the Boston papers a great snow storm was experienced there—which probably extended far south—on Saturday and Sunday last, and it is said the snow fell to an average depth of two feet. The roads are so much blocked as to be nearly impassable. Here, we had no snow and the ground is nearly as bare as in July. At the time it snowed so much south of this State, we experienced only a strong wind from the North East.

New Valuation.—We stated last week that the Valuation Committee was to be partly composed of persons who are not members of the Legislature.—Since then however, the Legislature has voted that the Committee shall be taken exclusively from the members. The following are the names of the gentlemen who constitute this Committee:

Oxford.—Messrs. Wyman, of Lovell, Small, of Jay; Howe, of Sumner.

Somerset.—Messrs. Coburn, of Bloomfield; Bradbury, of Athens; Stanley, of Industry.

Waldo.—Messrs. Ide, of Frankfort; Trafton, of Camden.

Penobscot.—Messrs. Davee, (Senate); Bartlett, of Garland; Piper, of Levant.

Washington.—Messrs. Mowry, of Lubec; Talbot, of Machias.

Hancock.—Messrs. Hutchins (Senate); Bryant, of Castine.

York.—Messrs. McIntire, of York; Powers, of Sanford; Clark, of Limerick; Emery, of Biddeford.

Cumberland.—Messrs. Ingalls (Senate); Mitchell, of Portland; Buxton, of N. Yarmouth; Hall, of Windham.

Lincoln.—Messrs. Dole, (Senate); Grey, of Bowdoinham; Lermond, of Union; Watts, of St. George.

Kennebec.—Messrs. Hinds, (Senate); Russ, of Farmington; Robinson, of Vassalboro'; Fisk, of Fayette.

House of Reformation. A person living not thirty miles from Boston, hearing that one of his neighbors had killed an ox, and thinking that a piece of the sirloin would make a good Sunday's dinner, called a companion and proceeded, after the family had retired to rest, to the barn where the ox hung suspended, with a stick between the flanks in the usual way. It was agreed that he should mount the cross stick and cut away, whilst the other kept watch. He had scarcely commenced operations when the stick slipped from under him, the ribs closed in and fairly locked him inside the carcass, his arms extended above his head and his feet projecting from the neck of the animal. His companion fled, leaving the prisoner to be released from his confinement by the owner of the ox, who, upon opening his barn at sunrise, greeted him with a hearty "Good morning."—*Transcript.*

We understand that on Monday last, John Ross, the President of the Cherokees, went into the Executive Office at Milledgeville, and served on the Governor some process from the Supreme Court, in contravention of the jurisdiction of Georgia over the Indians, but not signed like the former one by Chief Justice Marshall—entering abruptly into the office, and retired from it quickly without saying a word—perhaps anticipating what we understand was intended had he been subsequently found—that the Governor would return the compliment, by serving some process quite as abruptly on him, under the authority of the laws of Georgia to suppress the Indian Government, which make it a penal offence, punishable by four years' confinement in the Penitentiary, to exercise any authority whatever, under the sanction of that Government.—*Augusta (Geo) Chronicle Jan. 1.*

Boston Saving's Institution.—On Wednesday last, more than \$6,000 was received at this institution, from 365 depositors: 110 new accounts were opened.

MOORISH PIRACY.—Extract of a letter from an officer in the Mediterranean to his friend in Philadelphia, dated U. States sloop of war Concord, October 25, 1830. "Previous to leaving Gibraltar, on the 2d inst. information was received of the capture of two brigs, (one Sardinian and the other Maltese) by Moorish pirates, off the Barbary coast; the crews we understand have been murdered. It is advisable for vessels bound up the Mediterranean, to keep as near the Spanish coast as prudence will permit, as the pirates spoken of were committed by a gang of desperadoes, in an open boat. We shall run over to the Moorish coast on our way to Mahon. None of our squadron were at Gibraltar when we arrived and left; the Ontario had been there, and sailed for Mahon a few days previous to our appearance."

Boston Custom.—The following extract from the Town Records of Boston, is highly honorable to the character of the early inhabitants of that city.

"1635. Voted, that no member of this congregation or inhabitants among us, sue one another at the law, before that Mr. Henry Vane, and the second elder Mr. Thomas Oliver, and Mr. Thomas Everett, have had the hearing and decided the same, if they can."

Messrs. A. Wells & Co. exhibit at their room in Washington street, an elegant bronze Chandelier, imported for the young ladies of Gardiner, Maine, who intend to present it to the Episcopal Church in that town. The design is perfectly chaste and beautiful. It is entirely bronze, without lacer or gilding and in every respect suited to the purpose for which it was intended.—*Boston Transcript.*

It is said a man who was implicated in the murder of Mr. White, is suspected of the robbery of Mr. Crosby. He disappeared about that time. Persons are in Pursuit of him.—*Newburyport Herald.*

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"Elihu" and "D. N." will have attention soon.

APPOINTMENTS.

Br. J. W. HOSKINS has an appointment to preach in Ellsworth next Sunday.

Dr. A. A. Folsom will preach next Sunday, (the 23d,) in Poland.

MARRIED.

In Freeport, on Sunday last, Rev. ALBERT A. FOLSOM, of Portsmouth, N. H. to Miss HARRIET SAWIN, daughter of Mr. William Sawin.

In Hallowell, John Otis, Esq. Attorney at Law, to Miss Harriet Frances Vaughan, daughter of the late Col. Wm. O. Vaughan.

In Alfred, Wm. C. Allen, Esq. Counsellor at Law, to Miss Lucy Maria, daughter of Henry Holmes, Esq.

In Pittsford, Mr. John Kendall to Miss Margaret Smith.

In Anson, Mr. David Gilman to Miss Lydia Ingalls.

In Waterville, Mr. Eliphaz Gow to Miss Serena M. Russell.

DIED.

In Charleston, S. C. on the 31st ult. Mr. AUGUSTUS VERNON CHANDLER, of Augusta, aged 23.—Mr. Chandler was graduated at Union College, N. Y. in 1827, and for some time previous to his departure from this section of the country, which his ill health compelled him to leave, he superintended the editorial department of this paper. We cannot avoid mingling our sympathies with those of his numerous friends in this vicinity, by whom he will be long remembered, not less for his kind and benevolent feelings in the social intercourse of life, than for his highly intellectual character and correct moral deportment, which rendered him an object of peculiar interest to those around him, and caused his future prospects in life to be unusually flattering.

We understand that at the request of the deceased, his remains are to be brought to this place for interment, where it is expected they will arrive about the 1st of February.—*Augusta Patriot.*

In Alfred, Mr. Jonathan Farnum, aged 51.

In Baltimore, 8th inst. of consumption, Mr. Herman B. Quincy, of Portland, in the 27th year of his age.

In South Killingly, Conn. Mr. Daniel French, of this town, aged 34.

M. B. F. O. F.

WEDNESDAY evening next, January 26th, at 1-2 past six o'clock, P. M.

QUESTION FOR DISCUSSION.

Will high duties on foreign manufactured articles promote the commercial and agricultural interests of the United States?

N. B. Ladies and Gentlemen, not members, will be admitted.

A. G. DAVIS, Scribe.

21th day, 1st mo. A. L. 5535.

Patent Elastic Water-proof Caps.

L. L. MACOMBER,

(Opposite McLellan's Hotel.)

WOULD call the attention of the public to his PATENT ELASTIC WATER PROOF black and drab CAPS.—(affixed with India rubber) an entire new, and a beautiful article, perfectly impervious to water—becomes hard when exposed to rain, and yet so elastic as to admit of being doubled and twisted without sustaining the least injury—an excellent article for travellers, as they may be folded like a handkerchief and packed with clothes—for sale wholesale and retail by the Patentee.

Hat manufacturers, will find it for their interest to engage in the manufacture of the above article. Terms of rights, reasonable.

Gardiner, January 19, 1831.

LIST OF LETTERS

Remaining in the Post Office at Gardiner, Me. Dec. 31, 1830.

James Alleton,	Mirick Hopkins,
Lois Barnard,	Robert Johnson,
Josiah Brown,	William Kendall,
James Condon,	Thomas K. Lord,
James Corvill,	John Landerkin,
Benjamin Cobb,	Thomas H. McCauland,
James S. Craig,	Hannah Mear,
James Colbath,	John Morgan,
John Corry,	Samuel Noble,
Zelulon Douglass,	John Pinkham,
Benjamin Eastman,	John R. Post,
Enoch French,	John and Moody Palmer,
Sally Fling,	Zilpha Fierce,
Orin Farnham,	James Rogers,
John P. Fling,	Israel Richardson,
Nathaniel J. Goud,	William Robinson, Jr.,
Felix McGowen,	Parker Sheldon,
John C. Haskell,	John W. Wyatt,
Harriet Hall,	SETH GAY, P. M.

January 1, 1831.

APPRENTICE WANTED.

WANTED immediately, an active, intelligent and industrious young man as an Apprentice to the Printing Business. Inquire at this Office—*Ed.*

CHECK LOST.

LOST a check drawn by R. H. Gardiner upon the Gardiner Bank for \$40 in favor of Mrs. Caldwell. All persons are cautioned not to receive the same.

R. H. GARDINER.

Jan. 5.

